

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed April 20, 2004 claims 1-11 were allowed, and claims 15-17 were allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, claims 12-14, and 18-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 5,835,565 to *Smith et al.*

The amendment cancels claims 12-14 and 20-27 without prejudice to the subject matter contained therein, rewrites claim 15 to include the elements of claim 12 (the base claim), and amends claims 18-19 to depend from claim 15. The amendment also adds claims 28-35, which directly or indirectly depend from claim 1, and claims 36-39, which depend from claim 6. Support for claim 28 can be found in the specification on page 5, lines 27-32, support for claims 29-30 on page 5, lines 16-21, for claim 31 on page 5, lines 4-8, and for claims 32-35 on page 5, lines 8-15. Support for claims 37-39 can be found in the specification on page 9, in claims 8-10. No new matter has been added by the amendment, and claims 1-11, 15-19, and 28-39 are pending in the application.

As noted above, claims 12-14, and 18-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over *Smith*. This rejection is made moot by the amendment, which cancels claims 12-14 and 20-27, and amends claims 18-19 to depend from claim 15. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe claims 1-11, 15-19, and 28-39 are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/062,959
Amdt. dated June 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated April 20, 2004

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



Eugene J. Bernard
Reg. No. 42,320

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
G3B/bhr
60248557 v1